Saturnidæ.

58. Henucha dentata, sp. n.

Expanse $2\frac{5}{6}$ inches.

Female.—Closely allied to H. Delegorguei, Boisd.; the outer margin of the fore wing much more irregular, being bowed outwards at middle and more dentate; the outer margin of hind wing also is slightly more dentate. Both wings are much more suffused with fuscous than in Delegorquei, and the white band inwardly banding the outer area reaches the inner margin of fore and hind wings close to the outer and anal angles, instead of a good distance inside them.

Ommatophoridæ.

59. Cyligramma argillosa, Walk.

Ophiusidæ.

60. Achæa Lienardi, Walk.

XXI.—Critical Notes on the Genus Tebennophorus and the recent Literature relating to it. By Henry A. Pilsbry, Conservator of the Conchological Section, Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia.

THE slugs of this genus having been commented upon lately by a number of English and continental authors, who have arrived at very different results, it has occurred to the writer that a presentation of the subject by one who has studied the species in their native forests would not be without interest.

Firstly, regarding the proper name for the genus. We will consider the several designations in the order of their

publication.

In 1817 Blainville proposed a genus Limacella with the following characters:-

"Body limaciform, entirely naked, provided with a foot as

wide as itself, but separated by a groove.

"Orifices of the organs of generation widely separated and communicating between each other by a furrow which occupies the entire right margin of the body."

Blainville refers to his plate ii. fig. v, illustrating the type

species, L. lactiformis.

A moment's reflection will convince any competent mala-

cologist that the above description does not indicate Tebennophorus, a slug in which the genital organs have a common outlet. It cannot be supposed that Blainville has made a mistake in observation, because in the same paper he describes at length the external anatomy of Veronicella, and correctly locates the orifices. The figure given is equally noncommittal; so much so that Mr. Cockerell (who supposes Limacella to equal Tebennophorus) really cites "figures 4, 5" instead of 5 only "-his inability to tell Blainville's figure of Limacella (fig. 5) from that of Veronicella (fig. 4) being evidence enough that the former is not generically recognizable. As to the fact that Mr. Cockerell has found a couple of slugs under the name "Limacella lactescens" in the British Museum, which he supposes are the types of L. lactiformis, it is absolutely irrelevant to the subject. evidence is there beyond the merest guess-work that they are Blainville's types? And even if they were (a most improbable hypothesis!), their mere existence does not constitute publication. We have nothing to judge Limacella by save the original figures and description, and these certainly indicate a type of slug different from Tebennophorus.

It may also be noted that the name Limacella is preoccupied, having been used by Brard in 1815. If we care to be really consistent we must use Limacella in place of Agrio-

limax!

The second name for the genus is *Philomycus*, Rafinesque. This genus, says its author, "differs from Limax by no visible mantle, the longer pair of tentacula terminal and club-shaped, the shorter tentacula lateral and oblong." Rafinesque describes four species and says there are many more in the United States. Not one of those he described has been identified with any certainty, and only two species of Tebennophorus occur in the regions visited by him. Rafinesque also describes the genus Eumeles—"differs from Limax by no visible mantle, the four tentacula almost in one row in front and cylindrical, nearly equal, the smallest pair between the larger ones." Of this genus he describes two species, one of which, E. nebulosus, has been recognized by Mr. Cockerell, whose penetration and facilities have enabled him to identify new or old species which have escaped the observation of specialists on the American fauna.

We will not comment on these Rafinesquian genera; those who find slugs corresponding to them should of course use the

^{*} That this is not mere inadvertence on Mr. Cockerell's part is demonstrated by his remarks on Blainville's fig. 4 on p. 380 of the 'Annals' for November 1890.

names. Eumeles is especially remarkable, and we would invite the attention of conchologists who hunt slugs (in old collections of museums and elsewhere) to the unusual arrangement of the tentacles in this genus, and to the fact that a number of Rafinesque's species are still at large.

The genus *Meghimatium*, v. Hasselt, 1824, was founded on a species of this genus from Java, and was quite recognizably described. The names *Tebennophorus*, Binn., and *Incilaria*, Benson, were both proposed in 1842, the probable priority

being in favour of the first.

Morse in 1864 established the genus *Pallifera* for a species with ribbed jaw.

This review shows that several names for the genus, more or less certainly applying to it, were proposed anterior to 1842, the date of Tebennophorus. Of these names Philomycus and Meghimatium are the only ones available, Eumeles and Limacella being clearly inapplicable. Since continental authors generally have adopted the name Philomycus, it seems advisable to retain that designation for the genus if Tebennophorus must be rejected.

Philadelphia, December 2, 1890.

XXII.—Natural History Notes from H.M. Indian Marine Survey Steamer 'Investigator,' Commander R. F. Hoskyn, R.N., commanding.—No. 21. Note on the Results of the last Season's Deep-sea Dredging. By J. Wood-Mason, Superintendent of the Indian Museum, and Professor of Comparative Anatomy in the Medical College of Bengal, and A. Alcock, M.B., Surgeon I. M. S., Surgeon-Naturalist to the Survey.

[Continued from p. 19.]

Phylum APPENDICULATA.

Branch CHÆTOPODA.

Fragments from mud from 89 to 93 fathoms, from 1310 fathoms, and from sand from 98 to 102 fathoms, in the Bay of Bengal.